THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Now, we shall take up the Enacting Formula. There is one amendment, No.1, by Shri Shanta Kumar.

ENACTING FORMULA

SHRI SHANTA KUMAR: Sir, I move:

1. "That at page 1, line 1, *for* the word "Fifty-second" the word "Fifty-third be *substituted*."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.
The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.
The Title was added to the Bill.

श्री शांता कुमार : महोदय, मैं यह प्रस्ताव करता हूं कि:

"यथा संशोधित विधेयक को पास किया जाए।"

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Now, we will take up the Inter-State Water Disputes (Amendment) Bill.

THE INTER-STATE WATER DISPUTES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2001

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, 1956, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The question was proposed.

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI (Kerala): Sir, I rise, here, to point out certain deficiences and objectionable provisions in the proposed Amendment Bill.

The intention of this legislation is to expedite the process of adjudication. Of course, that is a welcome proposition. But my criticism is that the amendment, as proposed in the Bill, does not provide for that. Look at the amendments proposed to section 5 of the principal Act. The Tribunal has to give its verdict within a period of three years. If the verdict is not given within that period, then, the Central Government can extend the period by another two years. So, five years are there. If the Central Government or the State Government has any objection to the verdict, they can file an application within three months, and the Tribunal shall have to give the verdict within one year. But the proviso to the that particular sub-section is:

> "Provided that the period of one year within which the Tribunal may forward its report to the Central Government may be extended by the Central Government, for such other period as it considers necessary."

There is no time limit fixed. So, it is an open-ended thing. My suggestion is that a time limit should be provided in regard to the extension; otherwise, there will be no end to it. We need finality. This is my first objection.

The second objection is: the Central Government is taking away the powers of the Tribunal to appoint the assessors. The present provision is that the assessor to help the Tribunal, is appointed by the Tribunal itself. The present provision is:

> "The Tribunal may appoint two or more persons as assessors to advise it in the proceedings before it."

Now this particular power is being taken by the Central Government. This is the second objection.

The third objection is: a new section, section 9A, is proposed to be included here. I do agree that there is an observation made in the Report of the Sarkaria Commission. But the Central Government alone is maintaining a data bank and information system, at the national level, for each river basin. We know that these inter-State disputes are the most contentious issues in the country. The disputes have been continuing and continuing for years together. It is an emotional issue also.

6.00 p.m.

It is putting a lot of strain and stress in the body polity of our country. Now, the Central Government alone is maintaining the data bank and information. Therefore, the adjudication or the judgement of the Tribunal is mainly based on the data bank and information. The State Government has no role and it has no opportunity to raise its voice and objections. There is no provision for consultation. The Central Government is unilaterally maintaining this data bank and information. The Central Government asks the State Government to provide the information, and the Central Government applies its mind and keeps these things with it. This is, in a way, keeping more powers in the hands of the Central Government and there is every eventuality, in the present political situation, of the interests of the State Government being ignored in the process. Therefore, some provision for consultation and preparing the data on that basis is advisable. Otherwise, it will create further stress and strain in the Centre-State relations. Some provision for consultation between the Centre and the State for maintaining the data bank and information at the national level should be provided. These are the two important suggestions that I have to make for the consideration of the hon. Minister. Thank you.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, there are some good provisions in this Bill which need to be supported. But, I have my reservations in regard to sub-section (2) of section 9A. Sub-section (2) of section 9A says:

> " The Central Government shall have powers to verify the data supplied by the State Government, and appoint any person or persons for the purpose and take such measures as it may consider necessary. The person or persons so appointed shall have the powers to summon such records and information from the concerned State Government, as are considered necessary to discharge their functions under this section".

According to me, this sub-section is usurping the powers of the State. I submit that sub-section (1) of the proposed section 9A alone is adequate, as the same is in line with the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission. Therefore, I request that sub-section (2) of section 9A should be deleted. I am giving my reasons also. The State Governments have got

their own organisations with qualified and experienced officers to collect and maintain the required data and can transmit the data to the Centre, as and when desired. The Central Government has also installed its own gauging stations in almost all the inter-State rivers and is collecting the flow data, as also the data on quality, etc., and these data are already in its possession and can be utilised. The question of verification of State data by the Central Government through a person or persons appointed by it for this purpose does not arise, for the reason that the water flow is dynamic and not stagnant. What is measured at one point of time cannot be verified, at a later point of time. This is one of my contentions. All these years, in respect of development projects, which are passed on to the Government of India for sanction, the data collected by the respective State Governments were accepted and the projects were sanctioned on that basis. Verification of the data presented by the States has not been thought of, so far.

All the Tribunals constituted so far have given their final awards based on their decision and adjudication relying on the flow data and other related data supplied by the State Governments and proceeded thereon to make their decisions. They did not proceed to get the data verified by an external agency or the Government of India.

By virtue of Section 5(2) of the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, 1956, the Tribunals constituted for the adjudication of water disputes are themselves vested with powers as in civil courts under the Code of Civil Procedure to summon witnesses, ask for discovery and production of documents and call for any amount of data for analysis and understanding. For instance, in the Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal, the basin States have furnished a lot of data in respect of rainfall, flow, area irrigated and several other related aspects as called for by the Tribunal in the prescribed formats and they have been accepted and are being looked into in the process of their adjudication.

Certainly, this part of Section 9A (2) has not been suggested by the Sarkaria Commission and is an insertion which is sought to be struck off as it is not implementable and unnecessary.

Sir, in this regard, we met the Prime Minister also and gave him a memorandum requesting him to struck off Section 9A(2). So far as the Cauvery water issue is concerned, it is pending for a very long time. It is

the lifeline for Tamil Nadu. Even though the Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal had passed an Interim Award, but that order could not be implemented. Therefore, the Government of India should come to the rescue of Tamil Nadu to get its due share to save the farmers.

I reiterate that Section 9A(2) should be struck off in the interest of the States. Thank you.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Inter-State Water Disputes (Amendment) Bill, 2001 has been brought before the House with an intention to expedite the process of adjudication regarding inter-State water disputes. The purpose for which this Bill has been brought before us is going to be served or not is a question of debate. My colleagues have already expressed their apprehensions. According to Section 4, if a State makes a request to the Centre to appoint a Tribunal to go into the inter-State water disputes, the Central Government will take, maximum, one year to constitute an Inter-State Water Disputes Tribunal. Under Section 5 (2) the Tribunal can take three years to issue an award. If the Tribunal feels that it cannot issue an award in three years, the Central Government can give further extension of two years to the Tribunal. Therefore, one year is taken to constitute a Tribunal and that Tribunal can take three more years to issue an award and after that it can get extension of two years. If any explanation is sought or any guidance is required on the sentences or on the award issued, three more months can be taken to decide whether it can be given for explanation or guidance. It takes six years and three months to complete these formalities. Then, the Tribunal can take a further period of one year for giving an explanation; and, even after this one year period, that is, after the completion of seven years and three months, if the Government feels that explanation cannot be given within a year, then the Central Government is empowered to announce, and the Bill provides for this, and I quote: "Provided that the period of one year within which the Tribunal may forward its Report to the Central Government may be extended by the Central Government for such further period as it considers necessary." Therefore, it is not time-bound. It means that even after taking seven years' time, the Tribunal can take any further time, if the Central Government feels so. When, earlier also, there was no time-limit prescribed, even as per this Bill, there is no time-frame prescribed. This is the situation. Therefore, instead of extending the time like this, -- it is all right that the Prime Minister is given one year to decide on this as it is an

all-India issue and he might have to go through several issues before deciding on it, -- what I feel is that the award should be given by the Tribunal within a year from that time. If, in case, any explanation is required, it should be given within a period of three months. That is the maximum time that should be allowed; namely, one year for the decision to constitute a tribunal and one year for giving the award. This is enough. And, within a period of two to two-and-a-half years, this can be done. Keeping the time-frame of seven to seven-and-a-half years is not going to serve the purpose for which the Bill is intended. This is No.1. Secondly, as my colleague has pointed out, even though the Award is given, it is not being implemented properly. It is not a political issue nor is it a party issue. This concerns the State of Tamil Nadu as well as the State of Karnataka. Now, once the Award is given, it is being said that the decision of the tribunal, after its publication in the Official Gazette of the Central Government, shall have the same force as an order or a decree of the Supreme Court. We feel that it is a protection given to the concerned parties. Interim award is equivalent to the final award of the Tribunal. And, since the interim award carries the same weight as that of the final award, interim award should be considered as a judgement of the Supreme Court, and it can be enforced as it is being given for the protection of the people who have been affected.

Then, I come to clause 9 (a) (1). As per this clause, datas will be prepared by the State Government and then these will be forwarded to the Central Government. And the Central Government will maintain the datas. Then, regarding sub-clause (2) of clause (9) (a), what they are saying is, after Section 9 of the Principal Act, the following sub-clause is going to be inserted, namely, clause (9) (2) (a). As per this clause, if the Central Government wants to verify the data provided by the State Government, they have got the powers to do so. Actually, my colleague wants to strike it down. What I want to know is, if there is contradiction in the views of the Central Government and the State Government, and the State Government wants to stick to their data, how it is going to be solved. There is no provision in this Bill regarding this. The Bill simply states and I read: "The Central Government shall have powers to verify the data supplied by the State Government and appoint any person or persons for the purpose and take such measures as it may consider necessary. The person or persons so appointed shall have the powers to summon such records and information from the concerned State Government as are considered

necessary to discharge their functions under this Section." Now, if the opinion of the State differs with that of the Centre, then, how are you going to solve this? There can also be differences between States. If two States give two different datas and the Central Government has got its own data different from those provided by the State Governments, then, how are you going to solve the problem? What is the method? How are you going to justify that the opinion or the observation made by the Centre is correct? Sir, I feel that if an opinion or observation made by the State Government differs from the opinion of the Central Government, there should be some provision to ensure that justice is rendered to the States. That is my opinion. My friend has said that rain has come. I feel it is not so. It is a Supreme Court's judgement. Therefore, he should take back his words. I say that it is not correct. There are dams that have been constructed without the permission of the Central Government. That was the main issue. When they say that there is not sufficient water for their purpose, it is not so. The intention of the Bill is good. I appreciate it. But the way in which the Bill is drafted, there is a lacuna. It has to be rectified. Then, clause 9(2) has to be viewed very seriously so that justice is rendered to the States. In this age of information technology, no such length of period is necessary. With these words, I conclude with a hope that justice would be rendered to the farmers of Tamil Nadu. Thank you very much.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA (Karnataka): Sir, though the intention of the Bill is very good, it has to be looked into whether the proposed Bill would be able to solve the burning problem of the inter-State water disputes in the country. It is not only a question of Tamil Nadu and Karnataka. It is a heart-burning problem among the States, because of the difficulty in feeding masses and to facilitate farmers to grow more. That is why there is a difficulty in distributing whatever water resources are available with us. The intention of the Bill is, what should be the role of the Central Government when a dispute arises between the States. So far as the delay is concerned, I agree with my learned friend from Tamil Nadu. I do concede that even in such an ordinary matter, seven years, without any break, have been given for plain reading. Further, if any extraordinary circumstances come, it could be extended by one way or the other. But the problem will continue. So far as the other aspect, that is, the Centre-State relationship regarding data information collection is concerned, it is a worrying issue. Even though the Centre may say that it is a State subject and it has no right to interfere, but it may side with any of the States. It is a

hard fact that there is a difference of opinion in collecting the data. Though both sides have technical persons for collecting data, yet they are giving different pictures. Under these circumstances, who is the competent authority to have a final say? That is the Central Government. A new mechanism should be inserted in the Bill. The opinion of the so-called technocrats or the efficient technical persons, after assessing all the data, should have been obtained. But so far as the other aspect of the matter is concerned, the proposed amendment is also not going to solve the problem immediately. That is what I am going to urge. It is a sort of eyewash because the Act that came into existence in 1956, even after 40 years, has failed to solve the dispute between the States. The issue of Cauvery crops up in all the Sessions of the Parliament. I suggest to the Central Government that instead of bringing in this sort of amendment, it should bring a new policy after finding out what the present conditions in different States are, what the flow of water from each State is, what the pattern of crops is in each State, and what the share of each State should be. Unless that amendment is brought forward, no purpose would be served. My hon. friend just said that Karnataka is not honouring the award. Yes, as a true citizen of this country, I do agree. Every citizen of this country is bound to honour it, but it is not under the control of a human being. It is not something like exchange of money, or, simply, it is not transfer of property. The entire thing depends on the nature. If the nature is generous, if the monsoon is generous, definitely, there will be more rains, we will have more water and everybody would feel happy. Then, there would be equitable distribution of it. ...*(Interruptions)*... I am not stressing this point for academic interest. You must also look into the facts. Sir, here I am giving details. So far, there has been a wrong notion in the mind of some people that Karnataka is impounding more water and it is not releasing the same to Tamil Nadu. That is not correct.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN: It is true.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA: Sir, I am raising this point because in the State to which my hon. colleague belongs to, the farmers there are growing three crops in a year. But the poor farmers of Karnataka are growing only one crop, even though they are having more sources of water. The people of Tamil Nadu are trying to take advantage of the prescription which was established during the British raj. At that time, it was a subsidiary State. That was not a law. After Independence, what we did? We changed

laws for the benefit of our people and for the welfare of the common people. Even today, I am saying, let Tamil Nadu come forward for equitable distribution of water on the basis of actual availability of water and what is its share. Under these circumstances, I urge upon the Central Government to come forward with a new legislation which should contain all the aspects, like distribution, sharing, etc. I would like to suggest to the Minister of Water Resources to reduce the time period prescribed for settlement of disputes, as the period of seven years is too long. I would also suggest to him to work out a mechanism for settling disputes, as early as possible. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI SWARAJ KAUSHAL (Haryana): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have had the privilege of being associated with a few water disputes. The Cauvery Tribunal was one and the Yamuna Eradi Tribunal was another. Let me share with this House regarding the time taken by the Tribunal. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I happened to appear for the State of Haryana before the Tribunal. It was appointed in 1986. And in 1987, it gave the award. In 1987, both the States filed applications for clarifications which are pending since 1987. In the year 1997, I appeared for the State of Haryana and the Tribunal had assembled after a very long time. A request came from the State of Punjab that they wanted to amend the application for clarification of the award. The learned Chairman, Justice Eradi said, "How much time do you want?" The Punjab counsel said, "Sir, not less than two years, in any case." This was the amendment of application for clarification of the award. So, by the time I stood up, the Chairman said, "All right, adjourned for ten months and retired." With the result, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, right from 1986, till date, the Tribunal is functioning to dispose what? Not the award, but only applications for clarifications by the respective State Governments. So, I am very happy that the hon. Minister has come forward with a very good piece of legislation. But, one proviso of the Bill defeats the very purpose for which it is meant. My hon. friend, Mr. Virumbi spoke about that proviso. It says, "Provided that the one year time within which the Tribunal may forward its report to the Central Government, may be extended by the Central Government for such further period as it considers necessary." What is that period? What will happen to the Tribunals which have already crossed the maximum time limit provided in the Bill? That is what I want the hon. Minister to please clarify.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very

much thankful to all the hon. Members who have participated in the discussion on this Bill and suggested certain improvements. I must thank all of them. If we are able to carry out these improvements, I would certainly try to have them.

The whole purpose of this Bill is to improve upon the present system. As the hon. Member, Shri Swaraj, has already pointed out, there was no time limit in the 1956 Act. There was no time limit, but, in this particular Bill, we have suggested a particular timeframe. As Shri Virumbi observed, it may be long, but the intention is to provide opportunities for all the concerned States so that we can discuss with them; they can approach the Tribunal so appointed so that, within that time limit, all the aspects can be looked into. If there is mutual consultation between the States, then it could be solved.

The whole purpose of this Bill is to provide (1) speedy adjudication of river water disputes, and (2) time limit to the different States to consult each other. As we have seen in the case of Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, one State says one thing, and the other State says another thing. Here, they can have discussion and put forward their grievances before the Tribunal, and the Tribunal can look into the whole thing. This is the intention.

Sir, I should say that this particular Bill has been brought forward before this august House, as per the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission, and also as per the recommendations of the Inter-State Council, with which all the States have associated themselves. Whatever they have agreed to in the Inter-State Council meeting, that has been included in this particular Bill. So, I would say that all the aspects of this matter have been looked into. I have with me, the proceedings of the Inter-State Council meeting, as well as the recommendations of the Sarkaria Commission. Whatever they have suggested, and whatever has been agreed to at the Inter-State Council meeting, has been included in this particular Bill.

My hon. friend, Shri P.G. Narayanan, objected to the particular sections 9(a) and 9(2). Let us take, for instance, the Cauvery water dispute between Tamil Nadu and Karnataka. Both these states disagree with each other. Whatever data is provided to us at different meetings by one is disputed by the other. I have seen this for some time. Whatever data is

provided by one State, the other State objects to it and says, "This is not the correct data; our data is the correct one." Unless the Central Government has some sort of mechanism to independently look into all these data provided by the respective States, how can you resolve the disputes? That is why this particular section has been incorporated. The Inter-State Council...

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN: Sub-section 2 is unnecessary and is impractical. It can't be implemented.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: If all the members agree, it can be implemented. Why not? If not, please suggest to us as to what mechanism is available with the Central Government?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : If the States agree, you don't need to have a Tribunal. Only on that presumption you are bringing this Bill here.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI : In this Bill the Tribunal's verdict is final, as in the case of a judgement of the Supreme Court. It means no one will be allowed to approach the court again. This is certainly an improvement. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: One point is this. When data cannot be reconciled, as Mr. Virumbi and Mr. Pillai were pointing out, unless you have a provision of some kind of dispute settlement. What Mr. Naryanan is pointing out, that is also a genuine problem because it is a water-flow data. It is a dynamic data. What is the cut-off period and how are you going to subsequently verify it? So, a lot of problems are there. Therefore, I think some sort of reconciliation mechanism has to be provided.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: That is why, Nilotpalji, this is the main reason for the section to be incorporated for reconciliation of data. Certainly, we shall have power with the Central Government. Unless we have some sort of mechanism available with us, we cannot provide reconciliation data to the Tribunal itself.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA: I sought clarification with regard to the implementation. ...*(Interruptions)*... The implementation is subject to

availability of water. If there is no water, any judgement of the Supreme Court or the Tribunal would be a farce. No one can implement it on the earth. ...*(Interruptions)*... In those circumstances, I feel that a distance formula has to be incorporated. ....*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: I do not see any river having no water. ...*(Interruptions)*... I think a river without water can not be called a river...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री बालकवि बैरागी : माननीय मंत्री महोदय, आप तो उस नदी की बात कर रहे हैं जिसमें पानी नहीं है, लेकिन हमारे यहां एक ऐसी नदी है, जो है ही नहीं और उसका नाम सरस्वती है।

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI : The Saraswati was there. ...*(Interruptions)*... There is no doubt about it. ...*(Interruptions)*...Further I would like to inform the hon. Members that the Inter-State Water Disputes Act is meant to help the States to resolve their disputes and the water resources development in the Inter-State basin can go on without hurdles. It is not intended to be an encroachment by the Centre on the rights of the States conferred by the Constitution. There would be occasions when data is collected by the Centre from different States is conflicting and incompatible. This will require some verification and reconciliation. That is why, as I have already said, this section is very much needed. Unless this section is there, there will be no solution to the disputes. I request all the hon. Members to support this Bill. There will be improvement and there will be a time-frame available to all the States. There will be no ...*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI SWARAJ KAUSHAL : मंत्री जी, मैं एक निवेदन कर रहा हूं। Sir, I have raised a very serious issue relating to the Eradi Tribunal. When will the Tribunal complete its work?

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: When this Bill will be passed, certainly we will have ammunition with the Centre. We will be able to persuade the States and sometimes we can guide them that they should come to the table for solving the disputes. Swarajji, you understand everything. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, the hon. Member knows that it is a very delicate issue. I should not speak here on this issue. ...*(Interruptions)*.. I should not speak here. ...*(Interruptions)*.. If one State comes to the Centre,

another State says, "We have no time." During one-and-a-half year, I have tried to convene a meeting more than four times. If one CM says, "Yes, I will be available,", then the other says, "I have no time." You know everything. This is a very difficult issue. ...*(Interruptions)*.. However, please help. ....*(Interruptions)*..

SHRI SWARAJ KAUSHAL: I will just conclude. I will not make things difficult for the hon. Minister. I will make just one request. Will you take it up with the Eradi Tribunal to get a clarification at the earliest? That's all. I am saying it neither in my favour, nor against anybody. I am only saying that after this Bill is passed, will you please take up the matter with the Eradi Tribunal to dispose of this matter at the earliest which has been pending with them for the last 16 years? I am only seeking this clarification.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: I will certainly look into it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): It's okay. He has given an assurance.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, because it is a dispute between the States, I will certainly try to solve this problem.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, 1956, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): We shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): There is one amendment to be moved by the hon. Minister. Amendment No. 1.

Clause 3 - Amendment of section 4

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, I beg to move:

"That at page 2, line 13, for "2001", substitute "2002".

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

Clause 3, as amended was added to the Bill.

Clauses 4-6 were added to the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): Now, we shall take up clause 7 for consideration. There is one amendment by Shri R. Kamaraj. Hon. Member is absent.

Clauses 7 and 8 were added to the Bill.

Clause 1 - Short title and commencement

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): There is one amendment to be moved by the hon. Minister.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, I beg to move:

"That at page 1, line 3 *for* the figure "2001" the figure "2002" be *substituted.*"

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

ENACTING FORMULA

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SURESH PACHOURI): There is one amendment to be moved by the hon. Minister.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, I beg to move:

"That at page 1, line 1, *for* the word "Fifty-second" the word "Fifty-third" be *substituted*."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.
The Enacting Formula, as amended, was added to the Bill.
The Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : अब सदन की कार्यवाही बुधवार दिनांक 13 मार्च, 2002 प्रात: 11 बजे तक के लिए स्थगित की जाती है।

The House, then, adjourned at thirty-nine minutes past six of the clock, till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 13th March, 2002

MGIP(PLU)MRND—1755RS—21.06.2002.